UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/587,917	08/02/2006	Jean-Claude Vandevoorde	35619-0238-00-US	3644
	7590 06/27/200 DDLE & REATH	EXAMINER		
	LECTUAL PROPERT	HUYNH, LOUIS K		
	ONE LOGAN SQUARE 18TH AND CHERRY STREETS			PAPER NUMBER
PHILADELPH	IA, PA 19103-6996		3721	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/27/2008	PAPER

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/587,917	VANDEVOORDE ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Louis K. Huynh	3721			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 A</u>	s action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4)  Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)  Claim(s) 1,2,7-12 and 17-20 is/are rejected. 7)  Claim(s) 3-6 and 13-16 is/are objected to. 8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o  Application Papers 9)  The specification is objected to by the Examine 10)  The drawing(s) filed on 02 August 2006 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the	wn from consideration. r election requirement. er. a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected t	-			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/2/06.	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal P 6)  Other:	ite			

Art Unit: 3721

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 2. Claims 7-10 & 17-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
  - Claim 7, line 4: "the control track" lacks proper antecedent basis.
  - Claim 8, line 2: "the unit" lacks proper antecedent basis.
  - Claim 8, line 2: "the tracks" lacks proper antecedent basis.
  - Claim 8, line 2: "the carriage" lacks proper antecedent basis.
  - Claim 8, line 2: "the control tracks" lacks proper antecedent basis.
  - Claim 8, line 3: "the installation frame" lacks proper antecedent basis.
  - Claim 9, line 3: "the clamp" lacks proper antecedent basis.
  - Claim 17, line 3: "the clamp" lacks proper antecedent basis.
  - Claim 19, line 3: "the control track" lacks proper antecedent basis.
  - Claim 20, line 1: "the unit" lacks proper antecedent basis.
  - Claim 20, line 1: "the tracks" lacks proper antecedent basis.
  - Claim 20, lines 1-2: "the carriage" lacks proper antecedent basis.
  - Claim 20, line 2: "the control tracks" lacks proper antecedent basis.
  - Claim 20, line 3: "the installation frame" lacks proper antecedent basis.

Art Unit: 3721

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 4. Claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vandevoorde (US 5,060,367).
  - With respect to claims 1 & 11, Vandevoorde discloses an installation for fitting sleeves on bottles (6) that meets all of applicant's claimed subject matter; in particular, the installation of Vandevoorde comprises: a supplying device (1) for supplying sleeves (21); two pairs of transfer elements, each pair comprises two transfer elements (23), each transfer element is supported by a conveyor (circular plates 22), and a synchronizer (screw 4<sub>1</sub>).
  - With respect to claims 7 & 19, as best understood, each transfer element (23) comprises a fixed section (24) and a moving section (25) cooperating with the fixed section (24) to clamp the sleeve (21).
  - With respect to claims 8 & 20, as best understood, each transfer element comprises a control track (27) that is pivotally mounted on the conveyor (22).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 3721

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2 & 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vandevoorde (US 5,060,367).

The installation of Vandevoorde meets all of applicant's claimed subject matter but lacks the specific teaching of the synchronizer being an inlet star. Vandevoorde uses a screw (4<sub>1</sub>) for synchronizing the bottles (6) with the transfer elements (23) which serve the same function as the claimed inlet star. It is known in the art that star wheel and screw are both used for the purpose of regulating inlet spacing of article into packaging machine; therefore, it would have been obvious to a skilled person in the art, at the time of the invention, to have either uses a screw or an inlet star, as a matter of engineering designed choice, for synchronizing the bottles with the transfer elements.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

- 7. Claims 3-6 & 13-16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 8. Claim 9, 10, 17 & 18 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure and is cited on form PTO-892 along with the applied prior art.

Art Unit: 3721

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Louis K. Huynh whose telephone number is 571-272-4462. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8:00AM to 3:00PM.

11. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Rinaldi I. Rada can be reached on 571-272-4467. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

12. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private

PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you

would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the

automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Louis K. Huynh/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 3721

June 23, 20081